

maintain weapons that were specifically designed to fight the Soviet Union. It is not exactly the threat we need to worry about in the year 2007. That's why I am offering this amendment to H.R. 1585, an amendment that would require the DOD to identify all weapon systems that are currently being produced that were designed to fight the Cold War, identify their usefulness, and evaluate the cost of savings for eliminating these programs.

My amendment wouldn't eliminate a single program. Rather, it is simply asking the Department of Defense to take an inventory of what they are building that was designed to fight the Cold War and report back to Congress.

This December will mark the 18th anniversary of a meeting in Malta where the first President Bush and Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev declared an end to the Cold War. From there, it was another couple of years before the Soviet Union was disbanded, the Berlin Wall came down, and the Iron Curtain collapsed. The Cold War is over. It is time that the Department of Defense realized this and made the proper adjustments in their procurement programs.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, we are in strong opposition to this amendment. In fact, the Armed Services Committee under the very able chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri has finished a number of oversight hearings. The subcommittees that are involved in the Armed Services Committee and in Defense Appropriations Subcommittee have undertaken extensive hearings and analysis of every weapons system that we have. And, of course, you have many weapons systems that were built 20-30 years ago that were highly relevant, like the C-130s that Members fly on, that are the backbone of the transportation system, the intratheater transportation system in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Bradley fighting vehicles, M-1 tanks. There is no weapon system that comes out of a production line with the word "Cold War" on it, so the relevance and the importance and the use of weapons has been carefully and closely analyzed by the important committees, the oversight committees, and we are aided in that by the Quadrennial Defense Review that is done by the administration where they make their case for what they think that we need, and the President makes that proposition which is manifested in his budget. And after hearings, the members of this committee and the full body, this House of Representatives, respond with our cut on what we think we should do with respect to arming and maintaining and equipping our military forces.

So I would just strongly oppose the gentlelady's amendment, and say I have great respect for the gentlelady.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. BOREN).

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Department of Defense can and should review its weapon systems to ensure they are relevant to current threats. But by arbitrarily singling out Cold War systems, this amendment sends DOD the wrong signal.

The House Armed Services Committee has provided thorough and aggressive oversight in considering DOD's budget request. While fully funding the Department, the committee cuts billions of dollars from major programs we found to be outdated or irrelevant to current and future threats, shifting those funds to more urgent priorities such as the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle, MRAP vehicle. Every one of the weapons systems covered by the amendment has been reviewed during the three Quadrennial Defense Reviews held since the Cold War ended.

□ 1900

Many Cold War systems, like the Abrams tank, Bradley Fighting Vehicle and the B-52 bomber, have proven tremendously useful and effective in current operations.

This bill reflects responsible weapons priorities for current and future conflicts. I oppose this amendment because it puts DOD priorities in the wrong place, and I thank the gentleman from California and our chairman.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank my friend and colleague, a great leader, Congresswoman WOOLSEY, for her leadership once again on a very, very important issue.

It has been 16 years since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Yet I find it mind-boggling that in the last decade-and-a-half the Pentagon has continued to waste tens of millions, and billions really, of dollars buying outdated Cold War-era weaponry for a national security threat that does not exist.

Mr. Chairman, our spending on security should address the current threat that we face. That's why this amendment is so important.

By identifying and evaluating the usefulness of Cold War weapons systems, the report from the Pentagon that this amendment would require will give us a good starting point for eliminating wasteful programs. Contrary to what has been said, this is not arbitrary. In fact, military experts have identified at least \$60 million in these weapons systems.

By getting rid of these outdated programs, we'd not only make the much-needed investment in ensuring health care for all of our children, improving

our public schools, ending our dependence on foreign oil, but also improving our homeland security.

When you think about it, really, domestic security is national security. We don't need to sacrifice our domestic needs to ensure that our Nation remains safe. This amendment will take steps towards making this balance possible.

So I urge my colleagues to look at this amendment. It is very practical. It is very rational. It is very reasonable. And I want to thank my colleague from California for bringing this forward again so that we can really begin to have a full debate with regard to the taxpayer dollars.

We need to look at where our tax dollars are going in terms of the real threat that exists now in this 21st century. Certainly it has nothing to do with the Soviet Union. Certainly it has nothing to do with the Cold War era.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say we strongly oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of our time.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend and colleague from California for raising this issue, which I think is very important.

We are now confronting a situation in Iraq where the number of our military personnel who have been killed is approaching 3,400. Tens of thousands of others have been physically wounded, many of them very seriously. A good number of those deaths and wounds may be attributed to the lack of proper equipment.

We went into that situation, this administration sent our military forces into that circumstance there, without properly preparing for what they had to confront. In fact, they didn't have any idea what they were likely to confront. Many of the issues are that we have not developed the kinds of protection, the kinds of equipment, including transportation equipment and personal protection equipment, a whole host of things that are relevant to this situation, while we spend billions of dollars on materials that may have been necessary during the Cold War but which are no longer necessary now.

We need what this amendment calls for, a re-evaluation of those military activities and equipment, and this is a very simple thing, and it should be done.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California will be postponed.